But what is the "image to the beast"? and how is it to be formed? The image is made by the two-horned beast, and is an image to the beast. It is also called an image of the beast. Then to learn what the image is like and how it is to be formed we must study the characteristics of the beast itself—the papacy. {GC 443.1}

"The beast" mentioned in this message, whose worship is enforced by the two-horned beast, is the first, or leopardlike beast of Revelation 13—the papacy. The "image to the beast" represents that form of apostate Protestantism which will be developed when the Protestant churches shall seek the aid of the civil power for the enforcement of their dogmas. The "mark of the beast" still remains to be defined. {GC 445.2}

The Rise of Catholicism.
Its struggle with Arianism for supremacy.
An ideological warfare.

The Christian world was torn asunder by theological factions. Alexandria, the center of all philosophical study, was also the center of theological activity. Here is where the Greek influence was most forcibly felt. Athanasius, the leader of one faction, was archdeacon, and afterward bishop of Alexandria, and his opponent, Arius, was presbyter in the same city. {1901 SNH, SDP 229.1}

Paganism and Christianity met on the battlefield when Constantine contended for the throne of Rome; paganism and Christianity met in more deadly conflict in Alexandria, where Christian and pagan schools stood side by side. Here it was that such men as Origen and Clement, recognized Fathers of the church, adopted the philosophy of the Greeks, and applied to the study of the Bible the same methods which were common in the study of Homer and other Greek writers. Higher criticism had its birth in Alexandria. It was the result of a mingling of the truths taught by Christ and the false philosophy of the Greeks. It was an attempt to interpret divine writings by the human intellect, a revival of the philosophy of Plato. These teachers, by introducing Greek philosophy into the schools which were nominally Christian, opened the avenue for the theological controversies which shook the Roman world, and finally established the mystery of iniquity. {1901 SNH, SDP 229.2}

So from this false teaching of the Word in Alexandria came two leaders—Athanasius and Arius. Each had his following, and yet no man could clearly define the disputed point over which they wrangled. So great was the controversy that the Council of Nice was called to settle the dispute, and deliver to the church an orthodox creed. The emperor Constantine called the council, and was present in person. At this council the creed of Athanasius was recognized as orthodox, and Arius and his followers were pronounced heretics. {1901 SNH, SDP 229.3}

But announcing a creed is one thing, and having it adopted is another. The orthodox creed was published to the world, and then began the fight. In this strife armies fought and much blood was shed. But in spite of the fact that Arianism was heresy, the doctrine spread. It was popular among the barbarian tribes who invaded the western division of the Roman empire. The Vandals, who settled in Africa, were among the followers of Arius, and so also were the Heruli and Ostrogoths who settled in Italy. But while Arianism spread through Africa, Sardinia, and
Spain, and was present at times in Italy, the recognized religion of the Roman emperor and the empire itself, the northern kingdom, which now had its seat at Constantinople, was the Catholic faith, as proclaimed at Nice. As Constantinople was the representative of this northern division in his day, so later, between 527 and 565, Justinian became champion of the Catholic cause. {1901 SNH, SDP 230.1}


Dan. 11:30 For the ships of Chittim shall come against him: therefore he shall be grieved, and return, and have indignation against the holy covenant: so shall he do; he shall even return, and have intelligence with them that forsake the holy covenant.

11:31 And arms shall stand on his part, and they shall pollute the sanctuary of strength, and shall take away the daily sacrifice, and they shall place the abomination that maketh desolate. See GC 51.3;91.2;102.1;140.4;150.6;570.2;—VICARIUS FILLII DEI—666 See study Vicarius666. and GC appendix pg. 679 for page 50!!! Isa. 14:13

{D&R 1897 158.1 "Medo-Persia, Greece, Rome 1st phase; these all embraced the daily."} Ten Horns were not taken away to make room for papacy!

"An eradication of paganism from all the elements of the empire {D&R 1897 255.2-256.1}

When Satan has undermined faith in the Bible, he directs men to other sources for light and power. Thus he insinuates himself. Those who turn from the plain teaching of scripture and the convicting power of God's Holy Spirit are inviting the control of demons. Criticism and speculation concerning the Scriptures have opened the way for Spiritualism and theosophy--those modernized forms of ancient heathenism--to gain a foothold even in the professed churches of our Lord Jesus Christ. {ST, May 9, 1906 par. 6}

Side by side with the preaching of the Gospel, agencies are at work which are but the medium of lying spirits. Many a man tampers with these merely from curiosity, but seeing evidence of the working of a more than human power, he is lured on and on, until he is controlled by a will stronger than his own. He can not escape from its mysterious power. {ST, May 9, 1906 par. 7}

In our day, as of old, the vital truths of God's Word are set aside for human theories and speculations. Many professed ministers of the Gospel do not accept the whole Bible as the inspired Word. One learned man rejects one portion; another questions another part. They set up their judgment as superior to the Word, and the scripture which they do teach rests upon their own authority. Its divine authenticity is destroyed. Thus the seeds of infidelity are sown broadcast; for the people become confused, and do not know what to believe. There are many beliefs that the mind has no right to entertain. In the days of Christ the rabbis put a forced, mystical construction upon many portions of the Scriptures. Because the plain teaching of God's Word condemned their practises, they tried to destroy its force. The same thing is done today. The Word of God is made to appear mysterious and obscure in order to excuse transgression of
His law. Christ rebuked these practises in His day. He taught that the Word of God was to be understood by all. He pointed to the Scriptures as of unquestionable authority, and we should do the same. The Bible is to be presented as the word of the infinite God, as the end of all controversy and the foundation of all faith. {ST, May 9, 1906 par. 8}

The subject of Christ's teaching was the Word of God. He met questioners with a plain, "It is written;" "What saith the Scriptures?" "How readest thou?" At every opportunity, when an interest was awakened by either friend or foe, He sowed the seed of the Word. He who is the Way, the Truth, and the Life, Himself the living Word, points to the Scriptures, saying, "They are they which testify of Me." {ST, May 9, 1906 par. 9}

Now, the description given of these two witnesses is completed. The reader will judge for himself which system of interpretation is to be preferred,—that which adheres to the plain obvious import of the language, and seeks its meaning not in the regions of fancy, but in the sober relation of facts, or that which gives the rein to the imagination, and allows it to make any selection out of the whole chamber of its imagery, in which it can discover some faint resemblance to the simple truth which it rejects. To say that the Two Testaments have now or ever had "power to shut up heaven, turn water to blood, and smite the earth with plagues as often as they will," is to say that for which there is no authority whatever, no shadow of proof in either sacred or profane history. If, then, they have not these powers, they are not the two witnesses. Neither are the Waldenses nor Albigenses--nor would they ever have had this honor conferred upon them, had not a system of prophetical interpretation arisen which seemed anxious to make faith in the word of God as easy as possible, and to accomplish its object, stripped it of every thing marvellous by the simple method of renouncing the literal sense, and deciding that words of plain and well defined meaning should henceforth be regarded as metaphors, and their interpretation be figurative. That point being gained, and imagination called upon to apply those new principles of Hermeneutics, she amuses herself with brilliant displays of illustration,—dazzles and bewilders the unthinking multitude, but not instructs them, and not unfrequently brings the word of God into contempt. Alas! that so much darkness and obscurity should be wrought upon the best of books by a false system of interpretation. {February 1, 1841 JVHe, HST 164.2}

1Cor. 1:23 But we preach Christ crucified, unto the Jews a stumblingblock, and unto the Greeks foolishness;
1:24 But unto them which are called, both Jews and Greeks, Christ the power of God, and the wisdom of God.

Note: Here we see why Greek principles of learning are not sufficient to come to a knowledge of the truth.

Such were the influences clustering around the bishop of Rome, and thus was everything tending toward his speedy elevation to the supreme spiritual throne of Christendom. But the fourth century was destined to witness an obstacle thrown across the path of this ambitious dream. Arius, parish priest of the ancient and influential church of Alexandria, sprung his doctrine upon the world, occasioning so fierce a controversy in the Christian church that a
general council was called at Nicaea, by the emperor Constantine, A.D.325, to consider and adjust it. Arius maintained "that the Son was totally and essentially distinct from the Father; that he was the first and noblest of those beings whom the Father had created out of nothing, the instrument by whose subordinate operation the Almighty Father formed the universe, and therefore inferior to the Father both in nature and dignity." This opinion was condemned by the council, which decreed that Christ was of one and the same substance with the Father. Hereupon Arius was banished to Illyria, and his followers were compelled to give their assent to the creed composed on that occasion. (Mosheim, cent.4, part 2, chap.4: Stanley, History of the Eastern Church, p.239.) {1897 UrS, DAR 144.2}

We come now to the first instance in the fathers in which the term Lord’s day is expressly applied to Sunday. Clement is the father who does this, and very properly substantiates it with evidence. He does not say that Saint John thus applied this name, but he finds authority for this in the writings of the heathen philosopher Plato, who, he thinks, spoke of it prophetically! {1873 JNA, TFTC 57.8}

“And the Lord’s day Plato prophetically speaks of in the tenth book of the Republic, in these words: ‘And when seven days have passed to each of them in the meadow, on the eighth day they are to set out and arrive in four days,’ By the meadow is to be understood the fixed sphere, as being a mild and genial spot, and the locality of the pious; and by the seven days each motion of the seven planets, and the whole practical art which speeds to the end of the rest. But after the wandering orbs the journey leads to Heaven, that is, to the eighth motion and day. And he says that souls are gone on the fourth day, pointing out the passage through the four elements.” Book v. chap. xiv. {1873 JNA, TFTC 57.9}

Circumcision is made to prove twin errors of the great apostasy, infant baptism, and that the eighth day is the Lord’s day. But the eighth day in the case of circumcision was not the day succeeding the seventh, that is, the first day of the week, but the eighth day of the life of each infant, and therefore it fell on one day of the week as often as upon another. Such is the only argument addressed by Cyprian for first-day sacredness, and this one seems to have been borrowed from Justin Martyr, who, as we have seen, used it about one hundred years before him. It is however quite as weighty as the argument of Clement of Alexandria, who adduced in its support what he calls a prophecy of the eighth day out of the writings of the heathen philosopher Plato! And both are in the same rank with that of Tertullian, who confessed that they had not the authority of Scripture, but accepted in its stead that of custom and tradition! {1873 JNA, TFTC 92.2}

With respect to what he calls the Lord’s day, Origen divides his brethren into two classes, as he had before divided the people of God into two classes with respect to the Sabbath. One class are the imperfect Christians who content themselves with the literal day; the other are the perfect Christians whose Lord’s day embraces all the days of life. Undoubtedly Origen reckoned himself one of the perfect Christians. His observance of the Lord’s day did not consist in the elevation of one day above another, for he counted them all alike as constituting one perpetual Lord’s day, the very doctrine which we found in Clement of Alexandria, who was Origen’s teacher in his early life. The keeping of the Lord’s day with Origen as with Clement embraced all the days of his life and consisted according to Origen in serving God in thought, word, and deed, continually; or as expressed by Clement, one “keeps the Lord’s, when he abandons an evil disposition, and
assumes that of the Gnostic.”

Origen was born about A.D. 185, probably at Alexandria in Egypt. He was a man of immense learning, but unfortunately adopted a spiritualizing system in the interpretation of the Scriptures that was the means of flooding the church with many errors. He wrote during the first half of the third century. I have carefully examined all the writings of every Christian writer preceding the council of Nice with the single exception of Origen. Some of his works, as yet, I have not been able to obtain. While, therefore, I give the entire testimony of every other father on the subject of inquiry, in his case I am unable to say this. But I can give it with sufficient fullness to present him in a just light. His first reference to the Sabbath is a denial that it should be literally understood. Thus he says:—

“There are countless multitudes of believers who, although unable to unfold methodically and clearly the results of their spiritual understanding, are never- theless most firmly persuaded that neither ought circumcision to be understood literally, nor the rest of the Sabbath, not the pouring out of the blood of an animal, nor that answers were given by God to Moses on these points. And this method of apprehension is undoubtedly suggested to the minds of all by the power of the Holy Spirit.”—De Principiis, b. ii. chap. vii.

These are the only things in Hippolytus that can be referred to the Sunday festival. Prayers and offerings for the dead, which we find some fifty years earlier in Tertullian, are, according to Hippolytus, lawful on every day but the so-called Lord's day. They grew up with the Sunday festival, and are of equal authority with it. Tertullian, as we have already observed, tells us frankly that there is no Scriptural authority for the one or the other, and that they rest on custom and tradition alone. {1873 JNA, TFTC 89.8}

Tertullian in this discourse addresses himself to the nations still in idolatry. The heathen festival of Sunday, which was with some nations more ancient, had been established among the Romans at a comparatively recent date, though earlier than the time of Justin Martyr, the first Christian writer in whom an authentic mention of the day is found. The heathen reproached the early Sunday Christians with being sun-worshipers, "because," says Tertullian, "we pray towards the east, or because we make Sunday a day of festivity." And how does Tertullian answer this grave charge? He could not say we do it by command of God to honor the first day of the week, for he expressly states in a former quotation that no such precept exists. So he retorts thus: "What then? Do you [heathen] do less than this?" And he adds: "You have selected its day [Sunday] in preference to the preceding day" (Saturday), etc. That is to say, Tertullian wishes to know why, if the heathen could choose Sunday in preference to Saturday, the Christians could not have the same privilege! Could there be a stronger incidental evidence that Sunday was cherished by the early apostatizing Christians, not because commanded of God, but because it was generally observed by their heathen neighbors, and therefore more convenient to them? {1873 JNA, TFTC 70.2}

nominal |ˈnəmɪnəl| adjective
1 (of a role or status) existing in name only:

"Under Clodoveus king of France met the bishops in the first council of Orleans [A.D. 507], where they obliged themselves and their successors, to be always at the church on the Lord's day
(sunday), except in case of sickness or some great infirmity. And because they, with some other of the clergy in those days, took cognizance of judicial matters, therefore by a council at Arragon, about the year 518 in the reign of Theodorick, king of the Goths, it was decreed that 'No bishop or other person in holy orders should examine or pass judgment in any civil controversy on the Lord's day (sunday).'

The Vandals were Arians, but Hilderis, the grandson of their chief warrior, the noted Genseric, favored the Catholic faith. The disaffection of his subjects made it possible for Hilderis to be dethroned by Gelimer, who had some title to the Vandal throne. Under pretense of protecting the dethroned Hilderis, the emperor Justinian prepared for a war in Africa. While still undecided as to the advisability of making the attack because of the weakness of the Roman army, and the cost of the undertaking, his purpose was confirmed by the words of a Catholic bishop. Said he in prophetic tones, "It is the will of Heaven, O emperor, that you should not abandon your holy enterprise for the deliverance of the African church. The God of battles will march before your standard, and disperse your enemies, who are the enemies of his Son." This was sufficient, and the holy war for the extermination of Arianism was undertaken.

By the time of Jerome, the barbarians from the north who later founded the kingdoms of modern Europe, such as England, France, Germany, Italy, etc., were overrunning the Roman Empire. They cared nothing for the political monuments of the empire’s greatness, for these they leveled to the dust. But they were overawed by the external pomp and ritual of the Roman Church. Giants in physique, they were children in learning. They had been trained from childhood to render full and immediate submission to their pagan gods. This same attitude of mind they bore toward the Papacy, as one by one they substituted the saints, the martyrs, and the images of Rome for their former forest gods. But there was danger that greater light might tear them away from Rome.

Daniel considered the horns. Indications of a strange movement appeared among them. A little horn (at first little, but afterward more stout than its fellows) thrust itself up among them. It was not content quietly to find a place of its own, and fill it; it must thrust aside some of the others, and usurp their places. Three kingdoms were plucked up before it. This little horn, as we shall have occasion to notice more fully hereafter, was the papacy. The three horns plucked up before it were the Heruli, the Ostrogoths, and the Vandals. And the reason why they were plucked up was because they were opposed to the teaching and claims of the papal hierarchy, and hence to the supremacy in the church of the bishop of Rome.
following statements of historians. {1897 UrS, DAR 146.1}

Odoacer, the leader of the Heruli, was the first of the barbarians who reigned over the Romans. He took the throne of Italy, according to Gibbon (Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, Vol.III, pp.510,515), in 476. Of his religious belief Gibbon (p.516) says: "Like the rest of the barbarians, he had been instructed in the Arian heresy;" but he revered the monastic and episcopal characters, and the silence of the Catholics attests the toleration which they enjoyed." {1897 UrS, DAR 146.2}

Again he says (p.547): "The Ostrogoths, the Burgundians, the Suevi, and the Vandals, who had listened to the eloquence of the Latin clergy, preferred the more intelligible lessons of their domestic teachers; and Arianism was adopted as the national faith of the warlike converts who were seated on the ruins of the Western empire. This irreconcilable difference of religion was a perpetual source of jealousy and hatred; and the reproach of barbarian was embittered by the more odious epithet of heretic. The heroes of the North, who had submitted, with some reluctance, to believe that all their ancestors were in hell, were astonished and exasperated to learn that they themselves had only changed the mode of their eternal condemnation." {1897 UrS, DAR 146.3}

How was the daily, or paganism, taken away? As this is spoken of in connection with the placing or setting up of the abomination of desolation, or the papacy, it must denote, not merely the nominal change of the religion of the empire from paganism to Christianity, as on the conversion, so-called, of Constantine, but such an eradication of paganism from all the elements of the empire, that the way would be all open for the papal abomination to arise and assert its arrogant claims. Such a revolution as this, plainly defined, was accomplished; but not for nearly two hundred years after the death of Constantine. { 11 A LITERAL PROPHECY 283.1}

As we approach the year A.D.508, we behold a grand crisis ripening between Catholicism and the pagan influences still existing in the empire. Up to the time of the conversion of Clovis, king of France, A.D.496, the French and other nations of Western Rome were pagan; but subsequently to that event, the efforts to convert idolaters to Romanism were crowned with great success. The conversion of Clovis is said to have been the occasion of bestowing upon the French monarch the titles of “Most Christian Majesty” and “Eldest Son of the Church.” Between that time and A.D.508, by alliances, capitulations and conquests, the Arborici, the Roman garrisons in the West, Brittany, the Burgundians, and the Visigoths, were brought into subjection. { 11 A LITERAL PROPHECY 283.2}

The power of the empire was committed to the carrying on of the work before mentioned. “And they shall pollute the sanctuary of strength,” or Rome. If this applies to the barbarians, it was literally fulfilled; for Rome was sacked by the Goths and Vandals, and the imperial power of the West ceased through the conquest of Rome by Odoacer. Or if it refers to those rulers of the empire who were working in behalf of the papacy against the pagan and all other opposing religions, it would signify the removal of the seat of empire from Rome to Constantinople,
which contributed its measure of influence to the downfall of Rome. The passage would then be parallel to Dan.8:11 and Rev.13:2. { 11 A LITERAL PROPHECY 282.2}

But Roman history did not end with the division. Daniel watched, "And, behold, there came up among them another little horn, before which there were three of the first horns plucked up by the roots." A new power, a power outside the empire is here represented by the little horn. The Margin three divisions which were plucked up were the Heruli in 493, the Vandals in 534, and the Ostrogoths in 538 a. d. Justinian, the emperor, whose seat was at Constantinople, working through the general Belisarius, was the power which overthrew the three kingdoms represented by the three horns, and the reason for their overthrow was their adherence to Arianism in opposition to the orthodox Catholic faith. The details of the overthrow, and the religious controversy which was the root of the trouble, are fully given by Gibbon in the "Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire," by Mosheim in his church history, and by others. {1901 SNH, SDP 94.2}

{D&R 474.3-475.1}--Those who have and those who have not the seal of God.

_____________________

A force of Romans, the largest Belisarius could command from the weakened empire, aided by recruits from the east, landed in Africa. The Vandal army numbered 160,000 fighting men. Belisarius was hastened in his march toward Carthage by enemies of Gelimer and friends of the Catholic creed. The armies met near the Margin city, and victory came to the Romans through the folly and rashness of the brother of the Vandal king. Gelimer fled, and Carthage opened her gates, and admitted Belisarius and his army. "The Arians, conscious that their reign had expired, resigned the temple to the Catholics, who rescued their saint from profane hands, performed the holy rites, and loudly proclaimed the creed of Athanasius and Justinian." The Catholic faith had triumphed. Arianism fell, and Sardinia and Corsica surrendered, and other islands of the Mediterranean yielded to the arms and creed of Justinian. {1901 SNH, SDP 231.2}

Constantine and Justinian were the two men instrumental above all others in forming the papacy, and giving it civil power. The contest between Arianism and the orthodox Catholicism was the means of enthroning the papacy. A power soon to be recognized as the personification of all tyranny swayed the scepter of Rome, and the followers of the One who proclaimed a covenant of peace to Israel, would for the period of 1260 years struggle for existence. Every principle of truth was crushed, and with 538 was ushered in the Dark Ages. Margin {1901 SNH, SDP 234.1}

Arianism and World War II.

Protestant supremacy.
NOTE:—Hitler was Arian-Aryan, therefore an enemy of catholicism. The Rothschilds-Jews had their art/valubles looted by Germans.

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=T30q8vlnot0
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=eFXw9_706f4
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Nazi_symbolism#cite_note-10

**Mein Kampf**
Section Two.
CHAPTER VII.
THE CONFLICT/STRUGGLE WITH THE RED FORCES.

Not only because it incorporated those revered colours expressive of our homage to the glorious past and which once brought so much honour to the German nation, but this symbol was also an eloquent expression of the will behind the movement. We National Socialists regarded our flag as being the embodiment of our party programme. The red expressed the social thought underlying the movement. White the national thought. And the swastika signified the mission allotted to us—the struggle for the victory of Aryan mankind and at the same time the triumph of the ideal of creative work which is in itself and always will be anti-Semitic. para.72

Note: In this book Hitler mentions Aryan-ism 58 times. He was attempting to blot out what Protestants believe to be the christian history of Europe, for the Aryan view of European history.

Two major art works taken from Catholics by Hitler/Aryans:—
Ghent Altar piece
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ghent_Altarpiece
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/St_Bavo%27s_Cathedral,_Ghent
Madonna and Child; The Bruges Madonna:
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Madonna_of_Bruges
Waffen SS smashed all crucifixes when first invaded France:—4:03-5:22; 28:14-32:14;
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=AKzi6nlMckI
What kingdom shall be divided? Answer. The fourth kingdom. The Western empire of Rome, between the years A. D. 356 and 483, was divided to ten divisions, or kingdoms. 1. The Huns, in Hungary, A. D. 356. 2. The Ostrogoths, in Mysia, 377. 3. The Visgoths, in Pannonia, 378. 4. The Franks, in France, 407. 5. The Vandals, in Africa, 407. 6. The Sueves and Alans, in Gascoigne and Spain, 407. 7. The Burgundians, in Burgundy, 407. 8. The Heruli and Rugii, in Italy, 476. 9. The Saxons and Angles, in Britain, 476. 10. The Lombards, in Germany, 483. Thus the kingdom was divided as designated by the ten toes. {FUM J.W. 2.12} {1901 SNH, SDP 230.1} {1901 SNH, SDP 231.1}

Mien Kampf “nomads”
Arianism, Doctrine of.—Arianism, one of the most powerful and tenacious heresies in the history of the church, so called from Arius, a presbyter of Alexandria, who first reduced the doctrine to a clear expression, and made it the subject of public agitation in church and state. It involves the question of the divinity of Christ and his relation to the Father, and indirectly the whole dogma of the Trinity. It led to a series of violent controversies which, during the fourth century, shook the Roman Empire, especially in the East, to its very base. [p. 155] . . .

The Father alone is God; he alone is unbegotten, eternal, wise, good, unchangeable. He is separated by an infinite chasm from man, and there is no real mediation between them. God cannot create the world directly, but only through an agent, the Logos, who is himself created for the purpose of creating the world. The Son of God is pre-existent before time and the world (πρὸ χρόνων καὶ αἰώνων [πρὸ χρόνον καὶ αἰόνον]), and before all creatures (πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως [πρωτοτόκος πάσες κτίσεως]), a middle being between God and the world, the perfect image of the Father, the executor of his thoughts, yea, even the creator of the world of matter, and of the spirit. In a secondary or metaphorical sense he may be called God, Logos, and Wisdom (θεὸς, λόγος, σοφία). But, on the other hand, Christ is himself a creature (κτίσμα, ποίημα [κτίσμα, ποιήμα]), the first creature of God, through whom the Father called other creatures into existence; he is made, not of the essence of the Father (ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας [ἐκ τοῦ οὐσίου]), but out of nothing (ἐκ οὐκ ὄντων [ἐκ οὐκ οὖν]), or of the will of the Father before all conceivable time, yet in time; he is therefore not eternal, and there was a time when he was not (ἡμεῖς δεῦτε οὖν ἦν, ἀρχὴν ἔχει, οὐκ ἦν πρὶν γεννηθη, ἤτοι κτισθῆ [ἐν ποτέ οὖν ἔχει, ἐν αρχῇ ἐχεῖ, οὐκ ἦν πρὶν γεννηθῆ εἰ ἐτοι κτισθῆ]). Neither is he unchangeable, but subject to the vicissitudes of a created being (τρεπτὸς φῶς ως τὰ κτίσματα [τρεπτὸς ϕως ὡς τὰ κτίσματα]). In the last point Arius changed, having first asserted the unchangeableness of the Son (ἀναλοίοτος, ἀτρεπτὸς ὁ νιός [ἀναλοίοτος, ἀτρεπτὸς ὁ νιός]), unless we save his consistency by a distinction between moral and physical unchangeableness: the Son, it may be said, is changeable in his nature (φῶς [φῶς]), but remains morally good (καλὸς [καλός]) by an act of his will. With the limitation of Christ's duration is necessarily connected a limitation of his power, wisdom, and knowledge. It was expressly asserted by the Arians that the Son does not perfectly know the Father, and therefore cannot perfectly reveal him. He is essentially different from the Father (ἐτεροούσιος τῷ Πατρί [ἐτεροούσιος to Patri]) in opposition to the orthodox formula ὁμοούσιος [ὁμοούσιος], and the semi-Arian ὁμοούσιος [ὁμοούσιος] (hence also the name Heteroousiasts), and—as Aetius and Eunomius afterward more strongly expressed it—unlike the Father (ἀναμονετός καὶ ὀφθαλμων [ἀναμονετός καὶ οφθαλμῶν]). As to the humanity of Christ, Arius ascribed to him only a human body with an animal soul (ψυχὴ ἄλογος [ψυχῆ ἄλογος]), not a rational soul (νοῦς, πνεῦμα [νοῦς, πνεῦμα]); and on this point he anticipated Apollinarus, who substituted the divine Logos for the human reason, but from the opposite motive of saving the unity of the divine personality of Christ.—“A Dictionary of Christian Biography,” Smith and Wace, Vol. I, art. “Arianism,” pp. 155, 156. London: John Murray, 1877.
Or that Christ is not God!

This extraordinary edict of Constantine caused Sunday to be observed with greater solemnity than it had formerly been. Yet we have the most indubitable proof that this law was a heathen enactment; that it was put forth in favor of Sunday as a heathen institution and not as a Christian festival; and that Constantine himself not only did not possess the character of a Christian, but was at that time in truth a heathen. It is to be observed that Constantine did not designate the day which he commanded men to keep, as Lord's day, Christian Sabbath, or the day of Christ's resurrection; nor does he assign any reason for its observance which would indicate it as a Christian festival. On the contrary, he designates the ancient heathen festival of the sun in language that cannot be mistaken. Dr. Hessey thus sustains this statement:– {1873 JNA, HSFD 346.2}

"Others have looked at the transaction in a totally different light, and refused to discover in the document, or to suppose in the mind of the enactor, any recognition of the Lord's day as a matter of divine obligation. They remark, and very truly, that Constantine designates it by its astrological or heathen title, Dies Solis, and insist that the epithet venerabilis with which it is introduced has reference to the rites performed on that day in honor of Hercules, Apollo, and Mithras." Hessey's Bampton Lectures. p. 60. {1873 JNA, HSFD 346.3}

On this important point, Milman, the learned editor of Gibbon, thus testifies:– {1873 JNA, HSFD 347.1}

"The rescript commanding the celebration of the Christian Sabbath, bears no allusion to its peculiar sanctity as a Christian institution. It is the day of the sun which is to be observed by the general veneration; the courts were to be closed, and the noise and tumult of public business and legal litigation were no longer to violate the repose of the sacred day. But the believer in the new paganism, of which the solar worship was the characteristic, might acquiesce without scruple in the sanctity of the first day of the week." 1 {1873 JNA, HSFD 347.2}

And he adds in a subsequent chapter:– {1873 JNA, HSFD 347.3}

"In fact, as we have before observed, the day of the sun would be willingly hallowed by almost all the pagan world, especially that part which had admitted any tendency towards the Oriental theology." 2 {1873 JNA, HSFD 347.4}

On the seventh day of March, Constantine published his edict commanding the observance of that ancient festival of the heathen, the venerable day of the sun. On the following day, March eighth, 3 he issued a second decree in every respect worthy of its heathen predecessor. 4 The purport of it was this: That if any royal edifice should be struck by lightning, the ancient ceremonies of propitiating the deity should be practiced, and the haruspices were to be consulted to learn the meaning of the awful portent. 1 The haruspices were soothsayers who foretold future events by examining the entrails of beasts slaughtered in sacrifice to the gods! 2 The statute of the seventh of March enjoining the observance of the venerable day of the sun, and that of the eighth of the same month commanding the consultation of the haruspices, constitute a noble pair of well-matched heathen edicts. That Constantine himself was a heathen at the time these edicts were issued, is shown not only by the nature of the edicts themselves, but by the fact that his nominal conversion to Christianity is placed by Mosheim two years after his Sunday law. Thus he says:– {1873 JNA, HSFD 347.5}

"After well considering the subject, I have come to the conclusion, that subsequently to the death of Licinius in the years 323 when Constantine found himself sole emperor, he became an
absolute Christian, or one who believes no religion but the Christian to be acceptable to God. He had previously considered the religion of one God as more excellent than the other religions, and believed that Christ ought especially to be worshiped: yet he supposed there were also inferior deities, and that to these some worship might be paid, in the manner of the fathers, without fault or sin. And who does not know, that in those times, many others also combined the worship of Christ with that of the ancient gods, whom they regarded as the ministers of the supreme God in the government of human and earthly affairs." 3 {1873 JNA, HSFD 348.1}

As a heathen, Constantine was the worshiper of Apollo or the sun, a fact that sheds much light upon his edict enjoining men to observe the venerable day of the sun. Thus Gibbon testifies: — {1873 JNA, HSFD 349.1}

"The devotion of Constantine was more peculiarly directed to the genius of the sun, the Apollo of Greek and Roman mythology; and he was pleased to be represented with the symbols of the god of light and poetry. . . . The altars of Apollo were crowned with the votive offerings of Constantine; and the credulous multitude were taught to believe that the emperor was permitted to behold with mortal eyes the visible majesty of their tutelar deity. . . The sun was universally celebrated as the invincible guide and protector of Constantine." 1 {1873 JNA, HSFD 349.2}

His character as a professor of Christianity is thus described: - {1873 JNA, HSFD 349.3}

"The sincerity of the man, who in a short period effected such amazing changes in the religious world, is best known to Him who searches the heart. Certain it is that his subsequent life furnished no evidence of conversion to God. He waded without remorse through seas of blood, and was a most tyrannical prince." 2 {1873 JNA, HSFD 349.4}

A few words relative to his character as a man will complete our view of his fitness to legislate for the church. This man, when elevated to the highest place of earthly power, caused his eldest son, Crispus, to be privately murdered, lest the fame of the son should eclipse that of the father. In the same ruin was involved his nephew Licinius, "whose rank was his only crime," and this was followed by the execution "perhaps of a guilty wife." 3 {1873 JNA, HSFD 349.5}

Such was the man who elevated Sunday to the throne of the Roman Empire; and such the nature of the institution which he thus elevated. A recent English writer says of Constantine's Sunday law that it "would seem to have been rather to promote heathen than Christian worship." And he shows how this heathen emperor became a Christian, and how this heathen statute became a Christian law. Thus he says: - {1873 JNA, HSFD 350.1}

"At a LATER PERIOD, carried away by the current of opinion, he declared himself a convert to the church. Christianity, then, or what he was pleased to call by that name, became the law of the land, and the edict of A.D. 321, being unrevoked, was enforced as a Christian ordinance." 1 {1873 JNA, HSFD 350.2}

Thus it is seen that a law, enacted in support of a heathen institution, after a few years came to be considered a Christian ordinance; and Constantine himself, four years after his Sunday edict, was able to control the church, as represented in the general council of Nice, so as to cause the members of that council to establish their annual festival of the passover upon Sunday. 2 Paganism had prepared the institution from ancient days, and had now elevated it to supreme power; its work was accomplished. {1873 JNA, HSFD 349.2}

Thus it is seen that at the time when the early church began to apostatize from God and to foster in its bosom human ordinances, the heathen world - as they had long done - very generally observed the first day of the week in honor of the sun. Many of the early fathers of the church had been heathen philosophers. Unfortunately they brought with them into the church many of their old notions and principles. Particularly did it occur to them that by uniting with the heathen
in the day of weekly celebration they should greatly facilitate their conversion. The reasons which induced the church to adopt the ancient festival of the heathen as something made ready to hand, are thus stated by Morer:- {1873 JNA, HSFD 262.1}

"It is not to be denied but we borrow the name of this day from the ancient Greeks and Romans, and we allow that the old Egyptians worshiped the sun, and as a standing memorial of their veneration, dedicated this day to him. And we find by the influence of their examples, other nations, and among them the Jews themselves, doing him homage; 2 yet these abuses did not hinder the fathers of the Christian church simply to repeal, or altogether lay by, the day or its name, but only to sanctify and improve both, as they did also the pagan temples polluted before with idolatrous services, and other instances wherein those good men were always tender to work any other change than what was evidently necessary, and in such things as were plainly inconsistent with the Christian religion; so that Sunday being the day on which the Gentiles solemnly adored that planet, and called it Sunday, partly from its influence on that day especially, and partly in respect to its divine body (as they conceived it), the Christians thought fit to keep the same day and the same name of it, that they might not appear causelessly peevish, and by that means hinder the conversion of the Gentiles, and bring a greater prejudice than might be otherwise taken against the gospel." 1 {1873 JNA, HSFD 262.2}

The influence of Constantine powerfully contributed to the aid of those church leaders who were intent upon bringing the forms of pagan worship into the Christian church. Gibbon thus places upon record the motives of these men, and the result of their action:—{1873 JNA, HSFD 353.5}

"The most respectable bishops had persuaded themselves that the ignorant rustics would more cheerfully renounce the superstition of paganism, if they found some resemblance, some compensation, in the bosom of Christianity. The religion of Constantine achieved in less than a century, the final conquest of the Roman Empire: but the victors themselves were insensibly subdued by the arts of their vanquished rivals." 1 {1873 JNA, HSFD 354.1}

Haskell Proved!

The year in which the apostle John died, 100 A. D., is given as the date in which Justin Martyr was born. Justin, originally a pagan and of pagan parentage, afterward embraced Christianity and although he is said to have died at heathen hands for his religion, nevertheless, his teachings were of a heretical nature. Even as a Christian teacher, he continued to wear the robes of a pagan philosopher. {O.A.B.V. B.G. WILKINSON 16.1}

In the teachings of Justin Martyr, we begin to see how muddy the stream of pure Christian doctrine was running among the heretical sects fifty years after the death of the apostle John. It was in Tatian, Justin Martyr’s pupil, that these regrettable doctrines were carried to alarming lengths, and by his hand committed to writing. After the death of Justin Martyr in Rome, Tatian returned to Palestine and embraced the Gnostic heresy. This same Tatian wrote a Harmony of the Gospels which was called the Diatessaron, meaning four in one. The Gospels were so notoriously corrupted by his hand that in later years a bishop of Syria, because of the errors, was obliged to throw out of his churches no less than two hundred copies of this Diatessaron, since church members were mistaking it for the true Gospel. 19 {O.A.B.V. B.G. WILKINSON 16.2}
We come now to Tatian’s pupil known as Clement of Alexandria, 200 A.D. He went much farther than Tatian in that he founded a school at Alexandria which instituted propaganda along these heretical lines. Clement expressly tells us—"that he would not hand down Christian teachings, pure and unmixed, but rather clothed with precepts of pagan philosophy." All the writings

19 encyclopedias, “Tatian.”
20 J. Hamlyn Hill, The Diatessaron of Tatian, p. 9.

of the outstanding heretical teachers were possessed by Clement, and he freely quoted from their corrupted MSS. as if they were the pure words of Scripture. 21 His influence in the depravation of Christianity was tremendous. But his greatest contribution, undoubtedly, was the direction given to the studies and activities of Origen, his famous pupil. {O.A.B.V. B.G. WILKINSON 16.3}

When we come to Origen, we speak the name of him who did the most of all to create and give direction to the forces of apostasy down through the centuries. It was he who mightily influenced’ Jerome, the editor of the Latin Bible known as the Vulgate. Eusebius worshiped at the altar of Origen’s teachings. He claims to have collected eight hundred of Origen’s letters, to have used Origen’s six-column Bible, the Hexapla, in his Biblical labors. Assisted by Pamphilus, he restored and preserved Origen’s library. Origen’s corrupted MSS. of the Scriptures were well arranged and balanced with subtlety. The last one hundred years have seen much of the so-called scholarship of European and English Christianity dominated by the subtle and powerful influence of Origen. {O.A.B.V. B.G. WILKINSON 17.1}

Origen had so surrendered himself to the furore of turning all Bible events into allegories that he, himself, says, “The Scriptures are of little use to those who understand them as they are written.” 22 In order to estimate Origen rightly, we must remember that as a pupil of Clement, he learned the teachings of the Gnostic heresy and like his master, lightly esteemed the historical basis of the Bible. As Schaff says, “His predilection for Plato (the pagan philosopher) led him into many grand and fascinating errors.” 23 He made himself acquainted with the various heresies and studied under the heathen Ammonius Saccas, founder of Neo-Platonism. {O.A.B.V. B.G. WILKINSON 17.1}

21 Dean burgon. The Revision Revised, p. 336.

He taught that the soul existed from eternity before it inhabited the body, and that after death, it migrated to a higher or a lower form of life according to the deeds done in the body; and finally all would return to the state of pure intelligence, only to begin again the same cycles as before. He believed that the devils would be saved, and that the stars and planets had souls, and were like men, on trial to learn perfection. In fact, he turned the whole law and Gospel into an allegory. {O.A.B.V. B.G. WILKINSON 17.1}

Such was the man who from his day to this has dominated the endeavors of destructive textual
critics. One of the greatest results of his life was that his teachings became the foundation of that system of education called Scholasticism, which guided the colleges of Latin Europe for nearly one thousand years during the Dark Ages. \{O.A.B.V. B.G. WILKINSON 18.1\}

Origenism *flooded* the Catholic Church through Jerome, the father of Latin Christianity. "I love... the name of Origen," says the most distinguished theologian of the Roman Catholic Church since 1850, "I will not listen to the notion that so great a soul was lost." \{O.A.B.V. B.G. WILKINSON 18.2\}

A final word from the learned Scrivener will indicate how early and how deep were the corruptions of the sacred manuscripts: \{O.A.B.V. B.G. WILKINSON 18.3\}

"It is no less true to fact than paradoxical in sound, that the worst corruptions to which the New Testament has ever been subjected, originated within a hundred years after it was composed; that Iremeus (A.D. 150), and the African Fathers, and the whole Western, with a portion of the Syrian Church, used far inferior manuscripts to those employed by Stunica, or Erasmus, or Stephens thirteen centuries later, when moulding the Textus Receptus.\{O.A.B.V. B.G. WILKINSON 18.4\}

The basis was laid to oppose a mutilated Bible to the true one. How these corruptions found their way down the centuries and reappear in our revised and modern Bibles, the following pages will tell. \{O.A.B.V. B.G. WILKINSON 18.5\}

---


### CHAPTER II

The Bible Adopted by Constantine and the Pure Bible of the Waldenses

CONSTANTINE became emperor of Rome in 312 A.D. A little later he embraced the Christian faith for himself and for his empire. As this *so-called first Christian* emperor took the reins of the civil and spiritual world to bring about the amalgamation of paganism and Christianity, he found three types of manuscripts, or Bibles, vying for supremacy: the Textus Receptus or Constantinopolitan, the Palestinian or *Eusebio-Origen*, and the Egyptian of- Hesychius.\{O.A.B.V. B.G. WILKINSON 19.1\} The adherents of each claimed superiority for their manuscript. Particularly was there earnest contention between the advocates of the Textus Receptus and those of the Eusebio-Origen text.\{O.A.B.V. B.G. WILKINSON 19.2\} The defenders of the Textus Receptus were of the humbler class who earnestly sought to follow the early church. The Eusebio-Origen text was the product of the *intermingling of the pure word of God and Greek philosophy* in the mind of Origen. It might be called the adaptation of the Word of God to *Gnosticism*. \{O.A.B.V. B.G. WILKINSON 19.1\}

As the Emperor Constantine embraced Christianity, it became necessary for him to choose which of these Bibles he would sanction. Quite naturally he preferred the one edited by Eusebius and written by Origen, the outstanding intellectual figure that had *combined Christianity with Gnosticism* in his philosophy, even as Constantine himself was the political genius that was seeking to unite Christianity with pagan Rome. Constantine regarded himself as the director and guardian of this anomalous world church, and as such he was responsible for selecting the Bible for the great Christian centers. His pre-
dilection was for the type of Bible whose readings would give him a basis for his imperialistic ideas of the great state church, with ritualistic ostentation and unlimited central power. The philosophy of Origen was well suited to serve Constantine's religio-political theocracy. {O.A.B.V. B.G. WILKINSON 19.2}

They were Pagan!

By the time of Jerome, the barbarians from the north who later founded the kingdoms of modern Europe, such as England, France, Germany, Italy, etc., were overrunning the Roman Empire. They cared nothing for the political monuments of the empire’s greatness, for these they leveled to the dust. But they were overawed by the external pomp and ritual of the Roman Church. Giants in physique, they were children in learning. They had been trained from childhood to render full and immediate submission to their pagan gods. This same attitude of mind they bore toward the Papacy, as one by one they substituted the saints, the martyrs, and the images of Rome for their former forest gods. But there was danger that greater light might tear them away from Rome. {O.A.B.V. B.G. WILKINSON 45.2}

If, in Europe, these children fresh from the north were to be held submissive to such doctrines as the papal supremacy, transubstantiation, purgatory, celibacy of the priesthood, vigils, worship of relics, and the burning of daylight candles, the Papacy must offer, as a record of revelation, a Bible in Latin which would be as Origenistic as the Bible in Greek adopted by Constantine. Therefore, the Pope turned to Jerome to bring forth new version in Latin. {O.A.B.V. B.G. WILKINSON 45.3}

Jerome was devotedly committed to the textual criticism of Origen, “an admirer of Origen’s critical principles,” as Swete says.2 To be guided aright in his forthcoming translation, by models accounted standard in the semi-pagan Christianity of his day, Jerome repaired to the famous library of Eusebius and Pamphilus at Caesarea, where the voluminous manuscripts of Origen had been preserved.3 Among these was a Greek Bible of the Vaticanus and Sinaiticus type.4 Both these versions retained a number of the seven books which Protestants rejected as being spurious. This may be seen by examining those manuscripts. These manuscripts of Origen, influenced Jerome more in the New Testament than in the Old, since finally he used the Hebrew text in translating the Old Testament. Moreover, the Hebrew Bible did not have these spurious books. Jerome admitted that these seven, books—Tobith, Wisdom, Judith, Baruch, Ecclesiasticus, 1st and 2nd Maccabees—did not belong with the other writings of the Bible. Nevertheless, the Papacy endorsed them,5 and they are found in the Latin Vulgate, and in the Douay, its English translation. {O.A.B.V. B.G. WILKINSON 46.1}

The existence of those books in Origen’s Bible is sufficient evidence to reveal that tradition and Scripture were on an equal footing in the mind of that Greek theologian. His other doctrines, as purgatory, transubstantiation, etc., had now become as essential to the imperialism of the Papacy as was the teaching that tradition had equal authority with the Scriptures. Doctor Adam Clarke indicates Origen as the first teacher of purgatory. {O.A.B.V. B.G. WILKINSON 46.2}
Authorities for what is common law may, therefore, be as well cited, as for any part of the *lex scripta*; and there is no better instance of the necessity of holding the judges and writers to a declaration of their authorities than the present, where we detect them endeavoring to make law where they found none, and to submit us, at one stroke, to a whole system, no particle of which has its foundation in the common law, or has received the “esto” of the legislator. For we know that the common law is that system of law which was introduced by the Saxons on their settlement in England,¹ and altered, from time to time, by proper legislative authority, from that time to the date of Magna Charta, which terminates the period of the common law, or *lex non scripta*, and commences that of the statute law, or *lex scripta*. This settlement took place about the middle of the fifth century, but Christianity was not introduced till the seventh century; the conversion of the first Christian king of the Heptarchy having taken place about the year 598, and that of the last about 686. Here, then, was a space of two hundred years, during which the common law was in existence, and Christianity no part of it. If it ever, therefore, was adopted into the common law, it must have been between the introduction of Christianity and the date of Magna Charta. But of the laws of this period we have a tolerable collection by Lambard and *Wilkins, probably not perfect*; but neither very defective; and if anyone chooses to build a doctrine on any law of that period, supposed to have been lost, it is incumbent on him to prove it...
to have existed, and what were its contents. These were so far alterations of the common law, and
became themselves a part of it, but none of these adopt Christianity as a part of the common law.
If, therefore, from the settlement of the Saxons to the introduction of Christianity among them,
that system of religion could not be a part of the common law, because they were not yet
Christians, and if, having their laws from that period to the close of the common law, we are able
to find among them no such act of adoption, we may safely affirm (though contradicted by all the
judges and writers on earth) that Christianity neither is, nor ever was, a part of the common law.

1“Our ancient lawyers, and particularly Fortescue (chapter 17), insist with abundance of warmth that these
customs are as old as the primitive Britons, and continued down, through the several mutations of government and
inhabitants, to the present time, unchanged and unadulterated.” Blackstone’s” Commentaries on the Laws of
England,” introduction, page *64. Blackstone, however, assures us that these customs were influenced by the
customs of adventitious nations intermixing with the Saxons, and that Fortescue’s statement” ought only to signify,
as the truth seems to be, that there never was any formal exchange of one system of laws for another.”

Was Uriah Smith Semi-Arian?

Let’s let Smith have his say.

The impress of the Satanic hand is clearly seen in that the state of society sought for is exactly
the opposite of that established by God in the garden of Eden. There God was supreme; Christ,
by whom God made all things, was recognized and honored; God's law was the governing rule;
a spirit of true worship, prompted by love, controlled man's mind; the marriage relation was
sacred; and the Sabbath was honored as God's great memorial. In the French Revolution, God
was dethroned, Christ crucified afresh, Christianity denounced, and all restraint broken off from
the carnal heart, worship discarded, the rest-day abolished, the marriage relation annulled, and
society rent into mournful fragments. Let Communism prevail, and such is the state of society
we shall have again. {1897 UrS, DAR 735.4; 1912. 784.1}

Catholicism Vs. Islam.

"The king of Persia despised the obscure Saracen, and derided the message of the pretended
prophet of Mecca. Even the overthrow of the Roman empire would not have opened a door for
Mohammedanism, or for the progress of the Saracenic armed propagators of an imposture,
though the monarch of the Persians and chagan of the Avars (the successor of Attila) had divided
between them the remains of the kingdoms of the Caesars. Chosroes himself fell. The Persian
and Roman monarchies exhausted each other's strength. And before a sword was put into the
hands of the false prophet, it was smitten from the hands of those who would have checked his
career and crushed his power. {1897 UrS, DAR 496.3}